



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,661	10/31/2001	Akira Sugiyama	450100-03598	2440
20999	7590	11/01/2006	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			CZEKAJ, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2621	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/002,661	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUGIYAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dave Czekaj	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

On pages 6-7, applicant argues that Hanko fails to disclose wherein data received after the frame end signal is not processed and is designated invalid. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Hanko teaches in column 8, lines 45-48 receiving a frame end signal indicating the end of the current frame. The examiner notes discarding data or not processing and designating the data invalid is a conventional way of processing data when using frame end signals. Further, please note the pertinent art cited by the examiner further showing this processing as conventional. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

On page 8, applicant argues that Matsumura fails to disclose the means for receiving a frame end signal synchronized with end of frame data and detecting the end of a frame based on the signal. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example, Matsumura column 10, lines 51-59. There Matsumura discloses resynchronizing data with an end of block code. The examiner notes that the end of block code could indicate the end of frame data depending on how many blocks have already been processed and the size of the blocks. In recognizing the end of block code would not always correspond to the end of frame data, the examiner cited Hanko to further disclose this limitation. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumura et al. (US 5,835,144) in view of Hanks et al. (6493041), (hereinafter referred to as "Hanks").

As for Claim's 1 and 4, Matsumura et al. teach an input means for inputting the input data (Matsumura: Column 8, lines 3-6), start detecting means for detecting the start of the predetermined unit of the input data, in which the predetermined unit corresponds to a frame (Matsumura: Column 1, line 61 to Column 7, line 6; Column 9, lines 21-29; Column 9, lines 39-50), means for receiving a frame end signal indicative of the end of a number of frames (Matsumura: Column 10, lines 51-59; Column 9, lines 35-50); end detecting means for detecting the end of a respective frame based on the frame end signal (Matsumura: Column 10, lines 51-59; Column 9, lines 35-50), and signal processing means for making an action on the variable length code active at the start detected by the start detecting means (Matsumura: Column 8, lines 38-64), for making the action on the variable length code inactive at the end detected by the end detecting means (Matsumura: Column 10, lines 51-59; Column 9, lines 35-50), and for initializing the state of the action on the variable length code at the end detected by the end detecting means (Matsumura: Column 6, lines 55-

65). However, Matsumura fails to disclose the frame end signal as claimed.

Hanko teaches that prior art video systems provide poor results because they utilize adulterated versions of the video signal (Hanko: column 1, lines 44-47).

To help alleviate this problem, Hanko discloses means for receiving a frame end signal that is synchronized with end of frame data and is indicative of the end of each of a number of frames, wherein data received after the frame end signal and before the start of a next frame is not processed and is designated invalid (Hanko: column 8, lines 45-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Matsumura and add the end of frame signal taught by Hanko in order to obtain an apparatus that produces accurate results.

As for Claim 2, Hanko teaches the input data comprises MPEG data (Hanko: column 2, lines 45-46).

As for Claim's 3 and 5, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to record the output data (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to save the data for future use.

As for Claim 7, many of the limitations have been addressed in the above rejections. In addition, Matsumura et al. teach suspending processing for a period of time, the period of time being from the end of frame data to a subsequent start signal, when an error is detected (Matsumura: Column 8, line 65 to Column 9, line 29), detecting a start code for a corrected stream of data

Art Unit: 2621

(Matsumura: Column 9, lines 26-29), and re-initiating the processing step as a function of the detecting step (Matsumura: Column 9, lines 26-57).

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumura et al. (US 5,835,144) in view of Hanko et al. (6493041), (hereinafter referred to as "Hanko") in further view of Ching et al. (US 3,971,888).

As for claim 6, Matsumura et al. in view of Hanko fail to specifically teach where the means for receiving includes a flip-flop circuit, but Ching et al. does (Ching: Column 15, lines 4-37). Since the flip-flop circuit can be used to control how the signal is received by energizing and de-energizing the circuit, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use a simple flip-flop circuit or any other type of circuit that would be capable of controlling when the circuit is energized or not in order to control when the signal is received.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US-5907825      05-1999      Tzirkel-Hancock

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)272-7418. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2621

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DJC

*Mehrdad Dastouri*  
MEHRDAD DASTOURI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TC 2600